arXiv:1402.6674v1 [quant-ph] 26 Feb 2014

Quantum computation mediated by an ancilla of arbitrary dimension

Timothy Proctor[1], Shane Dooley and Viv Kendon[2]

School of Physics and Astronomy, E C Stoner Building, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

E-mail: [1]py08tjp@leeds@.ac.uk, [2]V.Kendon@leeds@.ac.uk

Abstract. Models of universal quantum computation where the required interactions between computational qubits are mediated by some ancillary system are highly relevant to experimental realisations of a quantum computer. We introduce two such models of quantum computation, the first of which employs a d-level (qudit) ancilla and the second of which is based on the coherent states of n spins. The computation is implemented with geometric phase gates, created via controlled displacement operators defined on a discrete lattice phase space, in the case of a qudit ancilla, and a Bloch sphere, in the case of a spin coherent state ancilla. Both of these models are shown to be different possible generalisations to finite dimensions of the field-mode quantum bus (qubus) computer. We then consider the computational complexity of the qubus architecture and show that although in certain circumstances the model can be used to reduce the number of operations required to implement quantum circuits, contrary to previous claims [New J. Phys. 13, 095007, 2011] this is not the case for the quantum Fourier transform (QFT). Furthermore, using the generalisation of the qubus model to a qudit bus, we show that this reduction in the circuit complexity depends on the dimensionality of the bus.

1. Introduction

A quantum computer has the potential to solve certain problems and implement simulations faster than any classical computer [1, 2]. Although many steps have been made towards a physical realisation of a quantum computer, a device that can outperform a classical computer remains a huge challenge. The original theoretical setting for quantum computation is the gate model [1, 3], where a global unitary on a register of computational qubits is decomposed into some universal finite gate set, often composed of a single entangling two-qubit gate and a universal set of single-qubit unitaries [4, 5, 6]. However, this model requires both individual qubit addressability, to implement single-qubit unitaries on each register qubit, and controllable coherent two-qubit interactions between arbitrary pairs of register qubits. This can be very experimentally challenging and so, motivated by this, alternative models of quantum computation have been developed.

One such model is measurement based quantum computation (MBQC), or the one

way quantum computer [7, 8]. In this model, the computation is achieved entirely via single qubit measurements and classical feed-forward on a highly entangled initial state called a cluster state [9, 10]. Experimental demonstrations of MBQC in photonic systems have been carried out, establishing the potential viability of the required measurement protocols [11, 12, 13]. Interestingly, it has been shown that this model has a greater parallel power than the gate-based standard quantum circuit model [14]. In MBQC it is possible to reduce the time required to implement the computation at the expense of an increase in the number of qubits, i.e., an increase in space.

An alternative route to improving the physical viability of a model is to mediate the interactions between computational qubits using some ancillary system. These schemes are based on the gate model and we shall refer to them as ancilla-mediated models. They encompass many of the experimental demonstrations of quantum computation and have many advantages over a direct implementation of the gate model. Firstly, it is not required that the ancillary system is of the same physical type as the computational qubits, allowing the choice of an ancillary system with which it is convenient to engineer an interaction with the register qubits. This is already often experimentally the case, with many hybrid systems proposed or physically realised, examples including the coupling of nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centres to superconducting flux qubits [15, 16] and the coupling of spin qubits via ancillary photonic qubits [17]. Furthermore, in such schemes the ancillary system need not be a qubit but may be of any dimension, such as in the case of superconducting qubits coupled via a transmission line resonator [18, 19, 20, 21, 22], semiconductor spin qubits coupled optically [23], or the coupling of a Cooper-pair box with a micro-mechanical resonator [24]. Furthermore, the extra dimensions of the ancillary system can have additional advantages in terms of the computational power of the model.

The most fully developed such computational scheme, the quantum bus model (qubus) [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30], employs a field-mode as the ancillary system and the interactions with the register qubits are via controlled rotations [30, 25, 26] or controlled displacements [27, 28, 29]. This computational architecture has been shown to be tolerant of moderate dissipation in the field-mode during the implementation of the computation [31, 32]. It has been claimed that the use of this ancillary field-mode can provide savings in the number of operations required to implement the quantum Fourier transform (QFT) on a register of qubits [28]. We show that, although this is true in many cases, this is not possible in the particular example of the QFT.

More recently, schemes have been developed where no access is required to the register qubits apart from via a single fixed-time interaction with an ancillary qubit. In these models both the two-qubit interactions and the single-qubit unitaries are implemented via the ancillary system. This is known as ancilla-driven quantum computation (ADQC) in the case where measurements of the ancilla are employed to drive the evolution [33, 34] and ancilla-controlled quantum computation (ACQC) when all the dynamics are unitary [35]. All the interactions that are universal for each of these models, using qubit ancillas, have been characterised [33, 35]. Furthermore, ADQC has

been generalised to a stochastic model, in order to increase the range of possible universal interactions to include those that are not maximally entangling [36, 37].

In this paper we generalise qubus computation to a model based on a finite-dimensional bus. In doing this we highlight the link between ancilla-mediated models with a discrete and a continuous bus. In section 2 we define the qubus model, based on controlled displacement of a field-mode. In section 3 we generalise this to a qudit bus by defining controlled displacement operators in the discrete phase space of a qudit and show that analogous results to the continuous case can be derived. This model is shown to be a universal quantum computer independent of the dimension of the qudit. Although it has many features in common with qubus computation, the continuous limit does not recover the qubus model.

An alternative discrete system that has many properties in common with a field-mode are the coherent states of n spins [38]. In section 4 we introduce a further discrete model, based on controlled displacement operators on these spin coherent states. We show that this model is an alternative generalisation of qubus computation and that in an appropriate limit, field-mode qubus computation is indeed recovered.

In section 5 we address the computational complexity of the qubus computer, both in the case of a field-mode bus and of the finite dimensional generalisations introduced here. We show that the qubus scheme can create savings in the required number of operations to implement particular circuits but that, contrary to previous claims [28], this is not the case for the quantum Fourier transform, due to the scaling of the required implementation time. Finally, we show explicitly, using the qudit model introduced here, that the computational complexity of a circuit in the qubus model is linked to the dimensionality of the bus. Despite this, for certain circuits a low dimension is sufficient to achieve computational savings.

2. Field mode qubus computation

We now introduce field-mode qubus computation based on controlled displacements [25, 27, 28, 29]. We review the phase space picture of a field-mode [38] and show that this can be used, via controlled displacements, to implement quantum gates. We will formulate what follows in a way that will make the analogy with the qudit generalisation as clear as possible. We consider one degree of freedom only, so the phase space is the plane $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. The relevant observables are the position and momentum operators, $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$ respectively, with $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i$, where we set $\hbar = 1$ throughout. We then consider translations in position and momentum given by

$$X(x) := \exp(-ix\hat{p}), \qquad P(p) := \exp(ip\hat{x}), \tag{1}$$

respectively. Their commutation relation can then be expressed in Weyl form as

$$P(p)X(x) = e^{ixp}X(x)P(p). \tag{2}$$

We then define the displacement operator by

$$\mathcal{D}(x,p) := e^{-\frac{i}{2}xp}P(p)X(x), \tag{3}$$

where the phase is optional and is chosen so that

$$\mathcal{D}^\dagger(x,p) = \mathcal{D}(-x,-p). \tag{4}$$

The displacement operator of Eq. (3) can be rewritten, using the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula [38], as

$$\mathcal{D}(x,p) = e^{i(p\hat{x}-x\hat{p})}. \tag{5}$$

We then define the coherent states by

$$|x,p\rangle := \mathcal{D}(x,p)|\psi_0\rangle, \tag{6}$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle$ is some fiducial state that is normally taken to be the vacuum $|0\rangle$ [39]. Displacement operators transform coherent states into other coherent states as

$$\mathcal{D}(x_2,p_2)\mathcal{D}(x_1,p_1) = e^{\frac{i}{2}(x_1p_2-p_1x_2)}\mathcal{D}(x_1+x_2,p_1+p_2). \tag{7}$$

If we associate the point (x,p) in phase space with the coherent state $|x,p\rangle$, we see that a displacement operator $\mathcal{D}(x_1,p_1)$ translates the phase space point (x_0,p_0) to the point (x_0+x_1,p_0+p_1). From Eq. (7) it is then clear that a set of displacement operators that form a closed loop in phase space will not translate a state in phase space but will create a phase that is dependant on the path taken in phase space. The phase created is $\exp(\pm i\mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is the area enclosed [40, 27] and the sign depends on the direction that the path is traversed, hence it is geometric in nature. The simplest case involves translations around a rectangle, which from Eq. 7 gives the phase

$$\mathcal{D}(0,-p)\mathcal{D}(-x,0)\mathcal{D}(0,p)\mathcal{D}(x,0) = e^{ixp}. \tag{8}$$

This can be represented graphically, as we will show in the case of controlled displacement operators, which we now introduce.

We consider an interaction between a computational qubit, in some computational register, with a field-mode ancilla. We do this by introducing the Hamiltonian [27]

$$H_f = \chi\sigma_{z_j}\otimes X(\phi), \tag{9}$$

where $X(\phi) = \cos\phi\hat{x} + \sin\phi\hat{p}$ is known as the quadrature operator, σ_{z_j} is the Pauli σ_z operator acting on the j^{th} computational qubit and χ is the interaction strength. The unitary implemented when this Hamiltonian is applied for a time t is given by

$$\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(x,p) := e^{-iH_ft} = |0\rangle\langle 0|_j\otimes\mathcal{D}(x,p) + |1\rangle\langle 1|_j\otimes\mathcal{D}(-x,-p), \tag{10}$$

where $x = \chi t\sin\phi$ and $p = -\chi t\cos\phi$ and $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are the $+1$ and -1 eigenstates of the σ_z operator respectively. We refer to this as a controlled displacement as the direction of the displacement depends on the state of the control qubit j. Using Eq.(8) it is then simple to see that

$$\mathcal{D}^{(k)}(0,-p)\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(-x,0)\mathcal{D}^{(k)}(0,p)\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(x,0) = e^{ixp\cdot\sigma_{z_j}\otimes\sigma_{z_k}}. \tag{11}$$

It is straightforward to show that this is locally equivalent [41] to the controlled phase gate $CR(4xp)$, where $CU = |0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes\mathbb{I}_2 + |1\rangle\langle 1|\otimes U$ with $U\in U(2)$ and

$$R(\theta) = |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle\langle 1|. \tag{12}$$

The local rotations required are of the form $R(2xp)$ on each computational qubit, up to a physically irrelevant global phase. Therefore, in matrix notation in the computational basis, controlled displacements around a closed rectangle are equivalent to the gate

$$e^{ixp\cdot\sigma_{z_j}\otimes\sigma_{z_k}} = e^{ixp}R(-2xp)\otimes R(-2xp)\cdot\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&1&0\\0&0&0&e^{4ixp}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

The choice of $xp=\pi/4$ gives the maximally entangling gate $CZ := C\sigma_z$ [27]. This gate can be represented pictorially in $\mathbb{R}^2$ as is shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: The gate of Eq. (11) represented in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The axes are the x and p quadratures. The initial state of the field-mode is assumed to be $|x_0,p_0\rangle$ in the diagram. However, it is clear from Eq. (11) that the state of the field-mode does not affect the implementation of the gate. The phase created is given by $e^{\pm ixp}$ where the phase takes the positive (negative) sign if the loop is traversed clockwise (anti-clockwise). This gate is local equivalent to a controlled phase gate, up to local rotations of $R(2xp)$ on each computational qubit and a physically irrelevant global phase.

2.1. Universal quantum computation with the qubus computer

Any entangling gate in conjunction with a universal set of single-qubit unitaries is universal for quantum computation [5, 6]. With the qubus model, we can implement entangling gates between computational qubits, including the CZ gate up to single-qubit rotations. Hence, controlled displacement operators in conjunction with a universal set of single-qubit unitaries are universal for quantum computation. Furthermore, this is clearly an ancilla-mediated model since no interactions are required between computational qubits. It is possible to implement diagonal local unitaries on the qubits via controlled and unconditional displacements on the bus [42] as

$$D^{(j)}(0,-p)D(-x,0)D^{(j)}(0,p)D(x,0) = e^{ixp\sigma_{z_j}}. \tag{14}$$

However diagonal gates do not provide a universal set. As the qubus model, based on the bus-qudit interactions given in Eq. (9), can only implement gates that are diagonal

in the computational basis [42], it is necessary to be able to implement some basis changing gate directly on the computational qubits. A suitable choice is the Hadamard gate, H, where

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1| \right). \tag{15}$$

A universal and fault tolerant set for single-qubit unitaries is the Hadamard and T gates [43], where

$$T = |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} |1\rangle\langle 1|, \tag{16}$$

can be implemented via the bus by taking $xp = \pi/8$ in Eq. (14). As direct access is required to the computational register, this model does not fulfil the tighter constraints of ADQC and ACQC, where all operations on the register must be implemented via a fixed time ancilla-register interaction [33, 35].

2.2. Physical implementation

The Hamiltonian of Eq. (9) can be engineered in various physical systems including superconducting charge or flux qubits coupled via a superconducting transmission line resonator bus [18, 19, 27] and the coupling of a Cooper-pair box with a micro-mechanical resonator [24]. Alternatively, it is also possible to simulate the unitary of Eq. (10) using a weak cross-Kerr type interaction, which implements controlled rotations, in conjunction with unconditional displacements on the bus [29, 40]. Cross-Kerr type interactions can be engineered using such techniques as electomagnetically induced transparencies (EIT) [44, 45], optical fibres [46, 47] and cavity QED systems [48, 49], including superconducting charge qubits coupled to a transmission line resonator bus [20, 21].

3. Generalising qubus computation to a qudit bus

We will now consider how the concepts used in qubus computation with a field-mode bus can be transferred to a finite-dimensional qudit bus. We will do this by first considering the phase space and displacement operator for a qudit, before then showing how, as in field-mode qubus computation, a conditional displacement operator can be used to implement the required quantum gates. Although the phase space of a qudit is sometimes considered to be a generalised Bloch sphere [50, 51, 52, 53] we will consider it as a finite lattice [54, 55].

3.1. The displacement operator for a qudit

We consider a quantum system with a finite d-dimensional Hilbert space, $\mathcal{H}_d$, often referred to as a qudit. We may take an orthonormal basis of this Hilbert space denoted by $|m\rangle_x$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$, with $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ the set of integers modulo d. We will call this basis the 'position' basis and the x subscript denotes this basis. We use the term 'position'

as we will shall introduce a 'momentum' basis and use translations in these 'position' and 'momentum' to define a displacement operator with similar properties to that of a field-mode.

The quantum Fourier transform on a qudit, F, is the unitary operator defined with respect to the position basis as

$$F := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{m,n} \omega_d(mn) |m\rangle\langle n|_x, \tag{17}$$

where ω_d is the d^{th} root of unity and

$$\omega_d(a) := \omega_d^a = e^{i\frac{2\pi a}{d}}. \tag{18}$$

We then define a second orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{H}_d$, the 'momentum' basis, by applying the Fourier transform to the position basis:

$$|m\rangle_p := F|m\rangle_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{n} \omega_d(mn) |n\rangle_x, \tag{19}$$

where p denotes the momentum basis. We can therefore represent an arbitrary state of a qudit in either the position or momentum basis. As both position and momentum are integers modulo d, the phase space defined by these bases is the toroidal $\mathbb{Z}(d) \times \mathbb{Z}(d)$ lattice, a torus with d^2 discrete points [54, 55].

In general $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ is a commutative ring with a unity, and multiplicative inverses do not always exists for every element of $\mathbb{Z}(d)$. This is because $a \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$ has an inverse in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$, denoted a^{-1}, only if a and d are coprime. When d is prime every element of $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ has an inverse in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ and hence it is a finite (or Galois) field. With the use of the concept of field extension it can be shown that there is a finite field of dimension d, denoted $GF(p^n)$, if and only if $d = p^n$, where p is prime. When $n \geq 2$ the rules of addition and multiplication are not those of modulo arithmetic. When the phase space can be labelled by elements of a finite field, that is $d = p^n$, it can be equipped with additional mathematical properties analogous to the geometry of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ [54, 56, 57, 58]. However, for the purposes of this work, we will not need any of this additional structure and so we will label points of the phase space, for any d, by (x, p), with $x, p \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$.

We now define the position and momentum operators, for which the basis states in each representation are eigenstates respectively, by

$$\hat{x} := \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} m|m\rangle\langle m|_x, \qquad \hat{p} := \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} m|m\rangle\langle m|_p. \tag{20}$$

We then define translations in position and momentum by

$$X_d^x := \exp\left(-i\frac{2\pi}{d} x\hat{p}\right), \qquad Z_d^p := \exp\left(i\frac{2\pi}{d} p\hat{x}\right), \tag{21}$$

respectively, where $x, p \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$ [55]. They can be shown to translate position (momentum) eigenstates to position (momentum) eigenstates as

$$X_d^x|m\rangle_x = |m + x\rangle_x, \qquad X_d^x|m\rangle_p = \omega_d(-xm)|m\rangle_p, \tag{22}$$

$$Z_d^p|m\rangle_p = |m+p\rangle_p, \qquad Z_d^p|m\rangle_x = \omega_d(pm)|m\rangle_x. \tag{23}$$

In the case of $d = 2$, X_d^1 and Z_d^1 are the Pauli σ_x and σ_z operators respectively, and hence they are known as the generalised Pauli operators. As the phase space is periodic we have that $Z_d^d = X_d^d = \mathbb{I}$. Finally we note that their commutation relation can be expressed in Weyl form as

$$Z_d^p X_d^x = \omega_d(xp) X_d^x Z_d^p, \tag{24}$$

which is analogous to Eq. (2) [55]. We now define the displacement operators on the phase space by

$$\mathcal{D}_d(x,p) := \omega_d(-2^{-1}xp) Z_d^p X_d^x, \tag{25}$$

where 2^{-1} is the multiplicative inverse of 2 in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ [59, 60]. 2^{-1} exists in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ only if 2 and d are coprime, that is only if d is odd. However, we will only be using displacements of the form $\mathcal{D}(x,0)$ or $\mathcal{D}(0,p)$ so we will not require the definition of a general displacement. As in the field-mode case the phase factor is optional, it is included to simplify the equations below and to emphasise the analogy with the field-mode case. We indeed note the similarity of Eq. (25) with the definition of Eq. (3). It is important to note that because x and p are in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ there are no infinitesimal displacements. Using Eq. (24), and noting the similarity to Eq. (4), it is straightforward to confirm that

$$\mathcal{D}_d^\dagger(x,p) = \mathcal{D}_d(-x,-p), \tag{26}$$

and furthermore, noting the similarity to Eq. (7), that

$$\mathcal{D}_d(x_1,p_1)\mathcal{D}_d(x_2,p_2) = \omega_d(2^{-1}(x_1p_2 - p_1x_2))\mathcal{D}_d(x_1+x_2, p_1+p_2). \tag{27}$$

Finally, we note that it follows from Eq. (26) that

$$X_d^{-x} = X_d^{\dagger x}, \qquad Z_d^{-p} = Z_d^{\dagger p}. \tag{28}$$

We now show that, in direct analogy with the field-mode case, we can create a phase by displacements around a closed loop in phase space. As in Eq. (8), we perform displacements in orthogonal directions in phase space, which are given by $\mathcal{D}_d(x,0) = X_d^x$, $\mathcal{D}_d(0,p) = Z_d^p$. To implement a closed loop through phase space we then implement the operator sequence

$$\mathcal{D}_d(0,-p)\mathcal{D}_d(-x,0)\mathcal{D}_d(0,p)\mathcal{D}_d(x,0) = \omega_d(xp)\mathbb{I}_d = e^{ixp\frac{2\pi}{d}}\mathbb{I}_d. \tag{29}$$

This can be shown using Eq. (24) and is represented graphically on the torus $\mathbb{Z}(d)\times\mathbb{Z}(d)$ in Fig. 2. If we consider the phase space points as being separated by a distance of $\sqrt{2\pi/d}$, we can then consider the phase created to be $e^{\pm i\mathcal{A}}$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is the area enclosed by the loop in phase space and the sign depends on the direction that the path is traversed, as in Eq. (8). However, as $xp \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$, the only phases that can be created by a closed loop in phase space are the d integer powers of ω_d. This is in contrast to the field-mode case, as there exist infinitesimal displacements in $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$.

It is possible to create any phase independent of the dimension of the qudit. We



Figure 2: The toroidal phase space of a d dimensional qudit: $\mathbb{Z}(d) \times \mathbb{Z}(d)$. In analogy with a field-mode in the phase space $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, a phase is created via displacements around a closed loop.

do this by generalising the momentum translation operator Z_d^p, which takes discrete arguments, to

$$P_d(p) := \exp\left(ip\hat{x}\right), \tag{30}$$

where $\hat{x}$ is given by Eq. (20) and $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly $Z_d^1 = P_d(2\pi/d)$. It is simple to show that

$$P_d(p)|m\rangle_x = e^{ipm}|m\rangle_x. \tag{31}$$

However, $P_d(p)$ does not in general transform momentum eigenstates into momentum eigenstates and so cannot be considered a translation of momentum, which is discrete. By calculating matrix elements in the position basis we have the Weyl commutation relation

$$P_d(p)X_d^x = e^{ixp}X_d^x P_d(p). \tag{32}$$

We then can then generalise the qudit displacement operator to

$$\mathcal{D}_d(x,p) := e^{-i\frac{xp}{2}}P_d(p)X_d^x, \tag{33}$$

where limiting p to integer multiples of $\frac{2\pi}{d}$ restricts the displacement operator to that of Eq. (25). Again the phase factor is not essential, but means that $D_d(-x,-p) = D_d^\dagger(x,p)$. We then have that

$$\mathcal{D}_d(0,-p)\mathcal{D}_d(-x,0)\mathcal{D}_d(0,p)\mathcal{D}_d(x,0) = e^{ixp}, \tag{34}$$

where $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and hence $xp \in \mathbb{R}$. This is therefore identical to the phase created in the field-mode case, given by Eq. (8).

3.2. Controlled displacement operators for a qudit

We introduce controlled displacements operators and show that we can implement two-qubit gates between pairs of computational qubits using a qudit bus, in direction analogy

to the field-mode qubus model. We do this, as in the field-mode case, by introducing a Hamiltonian. Define the effective z-spin operator for a d level qudit by

$$S_z = \mathrm{diag}(s, s-1, ..., -s+1, -s), \tag{35}$$

where diag is the diagonal matrix in the position basis and $s = \frac{d-1}{2}$. Now consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_d = \chi \sigma_{z_j} \otimes S_z, \tag{36}$$

where the σ_{z_j} acts on the j^{th} computational qubit and χ is the interaction strength. An equivalent Hamiltonian can be realised, using a photonic qubit with the computational basis the Fock states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, from the generalised Jaynes-Cummings model in the dispersive limit [61], which simplifies to the well known Jaynes-Cummings model [62] when $d = 2$. Alternatively, an interaction of this form could be engineered between a superconducting phase qudit [63] and a qubit.

The unitary effected by applying this Hamiltonian for a time t is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(0,p) := e^{-iH_d t} = e^{-ips}|0\rangle\langle 0|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}_d(0,p) + e^{ips}|1\rangle\langle 1|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}_d(0,-p), \tag{37}$$

where $p = \chi t \in \mathbb{R}$. As before, this is a controlled displacement, as the direction of the displacement depends on the state of the control qubit j. The additional phase factors will have no effect in any qubus like scheme, as any displacement is always followed by the conjugate of that displacement later in the sequence.

We now show how to create displacements of the form $\mathcal{D}_d(x,0)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$. We note that $X_d = F^\dagger Z_d F$ [55]. As $Z_d = P_d(2\pi/d)$, we can define controlled displacements in the position quadrature in terms of displacements in the momentum quadrature and the Fourier transform:

$$\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(x,0) := F^\dagger \mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(0, 2\pi x/d)\, F = \omega_d^{-xs}|0\rangle\langle 0|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}(x,0) + \omega_d^{xs}|1\rangle\langle 1|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}(-x,0), \tag{38}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{Z}(d)$. Clearly $\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(x,0)$ is a controlled displacement operator in the discrete position direction with additional phases. To implement $\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(-x,0)$ or $\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(0,-p)$ we may either replace $-x$ or $-p$ with the appropriate value in $\mathbb{Z}(d)$ and $(0, 2\pi]$ respectively, or bit-flip the computational qubit before and after implementing $\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(x,0)$ or $\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(0,p)$. We have therefore shown how to implement controlled displacements in the position and momentum quadratures using the Hamiltonian of Eq. (36) and the Fourier transform and its inverse on the qudit.

3.3. Computational gates using the qudit bus

We can now implement a two-qubit controlled phase gate with an arbitrary phase. From Eq. (34), we have that

$$\mathcal{D}_d^{(k)}(0,-p)\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(-x,0)\mathcal{D}_d^{(k)}(0,p)\mathcal{D}_d^{(j)}(x,0) = e^{ixp\sigma_{z_j}\otimes\sigma_{z_k}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_d, \tag{39}$$

where $xp \in \mathbb{R}$. This is equivalent to Eq. (11) for the field-mode, and hence this is equivalent to the 2-qubit gate $CR(4xp)$ up to local rotation of $R(2xp)$ on each qubit. We note that if the model is restricted to using the displacement operator of Eq. (25)

then the possible phases created would be limited to the d integers powers of ω_d.

We have shown that we can implement the entangling gates of qubus computation with any dimension of bus using the technique of geometric phases via controlled displacements in phase space. We will however show that certain aspects of the computational complexity of qubus computation do depend on the dimension of the ancillary Hilbert space. The discussions on the universality of the field-mode qubus model in section 2.1 apply directly to the qudit case. In particular, it is necessary to be able to implement a suitable basis changing single-qubit unitary directly on the register that, in conjunction with the bus-mediated diagonal gates, forms a universal gate set. Such a suitable gate is the Hadamard gate H.

3.4. Embedding a qudit in a harmonic oscillator

We discuss the $d \to \infty$ limit of the qudit bus and show that we do not recover the field-mode qubus model as defined in section 2. To consider the $d \to \infty$ limit it is convenient to embed the qudit in a harmonic oscillator [64]. This is done by associating the first d energy eigenstates, or Fock states, of the field-mode with the d position basis states of the qudit:

$$|j\rangle := |n = j\rangle_{HO}, \quad j = 0, 1, ..., d-1, \tag{40}$$

where the subscript HO denotes the states of the harmonic oscillator. We then have that

$$Z_d = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{d}\hat{N}}, \tag{41}$$

where $\hat{N} = a^\dagger a$ is the number operator for the harmonic oscillator [64]. It is simple to confirm that the action of this operator on the position basis is as required by Eq. (23). We also wish to consider the X_d cyclic ladder operator as the exponential of some Hermitian operator. If we do this we have

$$X_d = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{d}\hat{\theta}_z}, \tag{42}$$

where $\hat{\theta}_z$ is the Pegg-Barnett phase operator [65, 66]. This is well defined in the qudit subspace for finite d, and is analogous to the definition of the $\hat{p}$ operator in Eq. (20). However it cannot be exactly represented in the infinite Hilbert space and can only be considered using specific limiting procedures. Therefore, if we wish to take the $d \to \infty$ limit, and redefine the X_d and Z_d operations as continuous transformations, there are difficulties due to the problems of defining the phase operator. This is related to the non-unitary nature of the raising and lowering operators $a^\dagger$ and a. We note however that clearly in the infinite limit the computational basis is still the Fock states of the harmonic oscillator and not position or momentum eigenstates [64], and so we do not recover the model of field-mode qubus computation as defined in Section 2. Furthermore, provided that in any alternative limiting procedure the dimension of the Hilbert space remains countably infinite, the eigenstates of the position and momentum operators cannot correspond to their wave-mechanical equivalents.

4. Generalising qubus computation to a spin coherent state bus

We now define an alternative generalisation of the field-mode qubus computer, based on the coherent states of N spins. Again we will show that for finite N we can implement ancilla-mediated quantum computation and in this case the continuous limit does correspond to the field-mode model of section 2.

4.1. The displacement operator for spin coherent states

We first introduce the spin coherent states of a collection of qubits, also referred to as $SU(2)$ or atomic coherent states [67, 68]. The total Hilbert space for an N qubit system is $\mathcal{H}^{2^N}$. We consider a basis for each qubit composed of the $+1$ and -1 eigenstates of the Pauli σ_z operator, denoted $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ respectively. This is equivalent to the 'position' basis of Section 3 for $d = 2$. We then define a displacement operator on this Hilbert space by

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\theta, \varphi) := e^{i\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\sin\varphi J_x - \frac{\theta}{2}\cos\varphi J_y\right)}, \tag{43}$$

where $\theta, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $J_\mu = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sigma_{\mu_j}$ with $\mu = x, y$. Note the similarity of Eq. (43) to Eq. (5), where J_x and J_y have taken the place of $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$ respectively. As $\theta, \phi \in \mathbb{R}$, infinitesimal displacements exist. A spin coherent state of N qubits is then defined as

$$|\theta, \varphi\rangle_N := \mathcal{D}_N(\theta, \varphi)|0, 0\rangle_N, \tag{44}$$

where the reference state is taken to be $|0, 0\rangle_N = |1\rangle^{\otimes N}$. We have that

$$|\theta, \varphi\rangle_N = \left(\cos\frac{\theta}{2}|1\rangle - e^{-i\varphi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}|0\rangle\right)^{\otimes N}. \tag{45}$$

It is then clear that a spin coherent state is a separable state of N qubits with each qubit in the same pure state.

The phase space of N qubits restricted to such states can be represented on a Bloch sphere of radius N, as is shown in Fig. 3a. This phase space is continuous, in contrast to the discrete phase space of a qudit introduced in section 3. However, the phase space is spherical and periodic, in contrast to the planar phase space of the field mode. As N increases, the spherical space tends to the flat space of a field-mode locally around either pole. This limit is discussed in more detail in section 4.3.

The displacement operator can be interpreted as a rotation around some vector in the xy-plane. We consider geometric phases created by closed loops in phase space composed of orthogonal displacements. To do this we introduce an alternative parameterisation, analogous to writing the displacement operator for a field-mode in terms of a complex number α and the creation and annihilation operators $a^\dagger$ and a. We take $\zeta = -e^{-i\varphi}\tan\frac{\theta}{2}$ [38]. This is a stereographic projection of the sphere onto the complex plane. In this parameterisation we can write the spin coherent states as

$$|\zeta\rangle_N = \left(\frac{|1\rangle + \zeta|0\rangle}{\sqrt{1 + |\zeta|^2}}\right)^{\otimes N}, \tag{46}$$



(a) (b)

Figure 3: (a) The phase space of N qubits in a spin coherent state, a Bloch sphere of radius N. (b) A geometric phase is obtained by displacements on a coherent state around a closed loop. Here orthogonal displacements, that are rotations around the x and y axes, are used. We have that γ is related to the η of Eq. (50) by the stereographic projection and $\varsigma = \varsigma(\gamma(\eta))$ by Eq. (51)

and the displacement operator as

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\zeta) = \left(\frac{I_2 + \zeta\sigma_+ - \zeta^*\sigma_-}{\sqrt{1+|\zeta|^2}} \right)^{\otimes N}, \tag{47}$$

where $\sigma_\pm = \sigma_x \pm i\sigma_y$. It is straight forward to confirm that

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\zeta)|0\rangle_N = |\zeta\rangle_N. \tag{48}$$

These displacement operators transform coherent states to coherent states as

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\zeta_2)\mathcal{D}_N(\zeta_1)|0\rangle_N = \left(\frac{1-\zeta_1\zeta_2^*}{|1-\zeta_1\zeta_2^*|} \right)^N \left| \frac{\zeta_1+\zeta_2}{1-\zeta_1\zeta_2^*} \right\rangle_N, \tag{49}$$

where the term in front of the coherent state is a phase factor. This is analogous to the action of Eq. (7) or Eq. (27) on an appropriate coherent state.

We now show how to create geometric phases via orthogonal displacements. Displacements around the orthogonal x and y directions are given by taking $\cos\varphi = 0$ and $\sin\varphi = 0$ respectively. In the ζ parameterisation, this is equivalent to taking $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ respectively. We therefore consider a sequence of displacements, acting on a coherent state, of the form

$$\mathcal{D}_N(-i\zeta_4)\mathcal{D}_N(-\zeta_3)\mathcal{D}_N(i\zeta_2)\mathcal{D}_N(\zeta_1)|0\rangle_N = e^{i\phi_t}|\zeta_t\rangle_N, \tag{50}$$

where $\zeta_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1,2,3,4$. In order to create a geometric phase and no overall displacement we require that $\zeta_t = 0$. In the case of a flat geometry we can take $\zeta_3 = \zeta_1$ and $\zeta_2 = \zeta_4$ as in Eq. (8). However, if we take $\zeta_4 = \zeta_1 = \eta$ then, using Eq. (49), it can be shown that to satisfy $\zeta_t = 0$ we must take $\zeta_2 = \zeta_3 = \tau(\eta)$, where

$$\tau(\eta) = \frac{1-\eta^2-\sqrt{\eta^4-6\eta^2+1}}{2\eta}. \tag{51}$$

That there does exist such a τ can be seen schematically from Fig. 3b. Using Eq. (49) it can be shown that

$$\phi_t = N \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2\eta\tau + \tau^2 - \eta^2}{1 + 2\eta\tau - \eta^2\tau^2}\right). \tag{52}$$

Therefore as N increases, the size of the displacements needed to create the same phase decrease.

4.2. Controlled displacement operators for the spin coherent states

To introduce controlled displacements we take the Hamiltonian

$$H_N = \chi \sigma_{z_j} \otimes X(\phi), \tag{53}$$

where $X(\phi) = \sin\phi J_x + \cos\phi J_y$, as before σ_{z_j} is the σ_z operator acting on the j^{th} computational qubit and χ is the interaction strength. This is analogous to the Hamiltonian of Eq. (9), where $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$ have been replaced by J_x and J_y respectively. Applying this Hamiltonian for a time t implements the unitary

$$\mathcal{D}_N^{(j)}(\zeta) := e^{-iH_N t} = |0\rangle\langle 0|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}_N(\zeta) + |1\rangle\langle 1|_j \otimes \mathcal{D}_N(-\zeta), \tag{54}$$

where $\zeta = e^{-i\phi}\tan\chi t$. As before, this is a displacement operator controlled on the state of the j^{th} qubit. Displacements in the two orthogonal directions can again be achieved using only displacements in one phase space direction and local operations on the bus. This is because $(HS^\dagger)^{\otimes N} \cdot e^{i\theta J_x} \cdot (SH)^{\otimes N} = e^{i\theta J_y}$, where H is the Hadamard gate defined in Eq. (15) and $S = |0\rangle\langle 0| + i|1\rangle\langle 1|$. A displacement in one quadrature can be achieved using the same physical interactions as for the qudit bus in the case of $d = 2$, with many qubits equally coupled to a single computational qubit. To implement a computational gate, using Eq. (50) - (52), we have that

$$\mathcal{D}_N^{(k)}(-i\eta)\mathcal{D}_N^{(j)}(-\tau)\mathcal{D}_N^{(k)}(i\tau)\mathcal{D}_N^{(j)}(\eta)|\psi\rangle_{jk}\otimes|0\rangle_N = e^{i\sigma_{z_j}\otimes\sigma_{z_k}\phi_t}|\psi\rangle_{jk}\otimes|0\rangle_N, \tag{55}$$

where τ is given by Eq. (51) and ϕ_t by Eq. (52). This is clearly a two-qubit entangling gate between a pair of computational qubits and is equivalent to Eq. (11) and Eq. (39). As in the qudit case, the discussions of section 2.1 on the universality of the field-mode qubus model also apply directly to this model.

4.3. Infinite limit of the spin coherent states

In contrast to the qudit bus of section 3, we show that in the $N \to \infty$ limit of this model we recover field-mode qubus computation, as defined in section 2. The bosonic creation and annihilation operators, denoted $a^\dagger$ and a, can be defined in terms of $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$ by $a^\dagger := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{x} + i\hat{p})$ and $a := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{x} - i\hat{p})$. We have that by the Holstein-Primakoff transformation [69]

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{J_+}{\sqrt{N}} = a^\dagger, \qquad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{J_-}{\sqrt{N}} = a, \tag{56}$$

where $J_\pm := \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sigma_{\pm_j} = J_x \pm iJ_y$ [68, 70]. Then, using Eq. (56),

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathcal{D}_N\left(\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{N}}, \varphi\right) = e^{i(p\hat{x}-x\hat{p})} = \mathcal{D}(x,p), \tag{57}$$

which is the displacement operator for a field-mode, where $x = \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{2}}\cos\varphi$ and $p = \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{2}}\sin\varphi$. Furthermore it is possible to show that [71]

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left|\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{N}}\right\rangle_N = |\eta\rangle_{fm}, \tag{58}$$

where $|\eta\rangle_{fm}$ is a field-mode coherent state [70], as defined in section 2.

We have shown how to implement universal quantum computation using a spin coherent state bus composed of N spins in the finite N case, which includes the case of a single qubit bus, and that in the limit of infinite N this model is identical to field-mode qubus computation. However, in the next section we will see that both the field-mode and qudit bus have computational advantages over the spin-coherent state model introduced in this section.

5. Computational complexity of qubus computation

We begin this section with the definitions required to consider the computational complexity of qubus computation. The standard quantum circuit model (SQCM) is defined to be gate-based quantum computation using the universal finite gate set {CNOT,H,T} [43] where CNOT := $C\sigma_x$ and H and T are given by Eq. (15) and Eq. (16) respectively. The size of a quantum gate is the number of computational elements, that is the bus or computational and ancilla qubits, it acts on non-trivially. The size of a quantum circuit, C, denoted $size(C)$, is the sum of the size of all of its gates.

The depth of a quantum circuit, C, that acts on k qubits, denoted $depth(C)$, is the maximum from $\{D_1, D_2, ..., D_k\}$ where the D_j is the number of gates acting non-trivially on the j^{th} qubit. In the case of measurement based quantum computation the depth is the longest path of dependant commands, i.e., operations that depend on a previous measurement outcome, as it is assumed that independent measurements can be performed simultaneously [72]. This then does not take into account the depth of the classical processing of the measurement outcomes. If we assume that each gate can be performed in a unit of time and that gates on distinct computational elements can be performed simultaneously, then the computational depth gives the time required to implement a circuit.

5.1. Computational complexity of field-mode qubus computation

We have seen that we can implement CZ gates between pairs of computational qubits with each of the qubus models defined here in. We assume that Hadamard gates can be applied directly to the computational qubits and we have seen in section 2.1 that T gates can be implemented via the bus. Therefore, for any given circuit C, the computational

size and depth for an optimal qubus circuit is at most a constant factor increase from the standard circuit model decomposition. This assumes that multiple buses may be used to implement the circuit although this is not always required.

We now show that for certain unitaries, defined on a register of k qubits, there exists a qubus circuit decomposition that reduces the circuit size below that of any known SQCM decomposition without increasing the computational depth. We will only consider reductions in the required number of operations such that $\mathcal{O}(size(C_{\text{qubus}})) < \mathcal{O}(size(C_{\text{SQCM}}))$, where C_{qubus} and C_{SQCM} are circuit decompositions in the qubus and SQCM models respectively. This does not then include schemes such as that of Louis et al. [29], where it is shown how to reduce the number of operations required to implement nearest-neighbour interactions using a single bus from $4n$ to $2n$, which generalise to both forms of discrete bus in an obvious manner.

Qubus circuit decompositions can take advantage of certain features of the controlled displacements that are used to implement the geometric phase gates of qubus computation. The first of these is that displacements in the same direction in phase space commute and do not create a phase. We have that

$$D^{(k)}(x,p)D^{(j)}(x,p) = D^{(j)}(x,p)D^{(k)}(x,p) = D(x^{j+k}, p^{j+k}) \tag{59}$$

where $j(k)$ is $+1$ or -1 if the $j^{th}(k^{th})$ qubit is in the state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ respectively. This follows from Eq. (7) and is equally valid in the discrete models. Therefore a set of commuting gates controlled by a single qubit (labelled 1) on k target qubits (labelled 2 to $k+1$) can be implemented by local rotations into the basis in which all of the gates are diagonal followed by the interaction sequence

(i) $D^{(1)}(x_1, 0)$,
(ii) $D^{(k+1)}(0, p_k)...D^{(2)}(0, p_2)$,
(iii) $D^{(1)}(-x_1, 0)$,
(iv) $D^{(k+1)}(0, -p_k)...D^{(2)}(0, -p_2)$,

with appropriately chosen variables, followed by local diagonal corrections and a return to the computational basis.

Furthermore, once step (iii) has been implemented and the control qubit has been disentangled from the bus it is not necessary to disentangle the other k qubits immediately. It is only required that at some point later in the sequence they are disentangled from the bus. For example, replacing step (iv) in the above sequence with

(iv) $D^{(2)}(0, -p_2)$,
(v) $D^{(2)}(x_2, 0)$,
(vi) $D^{(k+1)}(0, -p_k)...D^{(3)}(0, -p_3)$
(vii) $D^{(2)}(-x_2, 0)$,

implements non-trivial two-qubit gates, dependant on the choices of x_2 and p_3 to p_k, between the second qubit and the remaining $k-1$ qubits at the cost of only 2 further operations (steps (v) and (vii)).



Figure 4: A generic circuit with the structure of the quantum Fourier transform on k qubits. The two-qubit gates are controlled rotations, $CR(\theta)$, where $R(\theta)$ is given by Eq. (12). We denote the unitary implemented by this circuit acting on k qubits as $G(k)$ and the decomposition shown in this figure as $G(k)_{\mathrm{SQCM}}$, as each of the gates may be decomposed into gates from the SQCM using standard techniques. If $U_j = H$ for all j and $x_m p_n = \frac{2\pi}{2^{n-m+1}}$, the unitary implemented is the quantum Fourier transform on k qubits [73], denoted $\mathrm{QFT}(k)$. We have that $\mathcal{O}(size(G(k)_{\mathrm{SQCM}})) = k^2$ and $\mathcal{O}(depth(G(k)_{\mathrm{SQCM}})) = k$ as many of the controlled rotations commute through the single-qubit unitaries and gates on distinct qubits can be implemented simultaneously [74].



Figure 5: A qubus circuit that implements $G(k)$, denoted $G(k)_{\mathrm{qubus}}$, using an alternative decomposition to the SQCM circuit of Fig. 4. The controlled operations are controlled displacements, with blue boxes and x variables indicating displacements in the position direction and white boxes with p variables indicating displacements in the momentum direction. We have that $x_m^{'} = a\frac{x_m}{2}$ and $p_n^{'} = \frac{p_n}{2a}$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $V_j = R(2p_j^{'}\sum_{m=1}^{j-1} x_m^{'})U_j R(2x_j^{'}\sum_{n=j+1}^{k} p_n^{'})$ where $R(\theta)$ is given by Eq. (12) and $p_1^{'} = x_k^{'} = 0$ with x_m, p_n and U_j the variables in the decomposition of Fig. 4. The form of the local corrections, V_j, can be calculated from Eq. (13). Under the assumption that each displacement is of unit depth, $\mathcal{O}(size(G(k)_{\mathrm{qubus}})) = \mathcal{O}(depth(G(k)_{\mathrm{qubus}})) = k$.

We consider the circuit in Fig. 4, which implements a unitary on k qubits that we denote $G(k)$. A particular case of $G(k)$ is the quantum Fourier transform on k qubits [2], denoted $\mathrm{QFT}(k)$. By repeatedly applying the techniques described above it is then possible to decompose this into the qubus circuit shown in Fig. 5 [28]. From the circuit decompositions of Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, we have that for any choice of $G(k)$, that is any

choice of x_m, p_n and U_j, there exists $G(k)_{\text{qubus}}$ and $G(k)_{\text{SQCM}}$ circuits such that

$$\mathcal{O}(size(G(k)_{\text{SQCM}})) = k^2, \qquad \mathcal{O}(depth(G(k)_{\text{SQCM}})) = k, \tag{60}$$

and,

$$\mathcal{O}(size(G(k)_{\text{qubus}})) = \mathcal{O}(depth(G(k)_{\text{qubus}})) = k. \tag{61}$$

Except for specific cases of $G(k)$ that are given by setting many of the operations in the decomposition of Fig. 4 to the identity (i.e some of x_m, p_n and U_j chosen to be trivial), such as the entirely trivial case of $G(k) = \mathbb{I}$, there is no known SQCM decomposition of $G(k)$ such that $\mathcal{O}(size(G(k)_{\text{SQCM}})) \leq k$ and $\mathcal{O}(depth(G(k)_{\text{SQCM}})) \leq k$.

Therefore, for certain quantum circuits there exists qubus circuit decompositions with a lower order of size complexity than the best known SQCM decompositions. In the case of $G(k)$ this is achieved at no increase in the scaling of the computational depth under the assumption that each controlled displacements is of unit depth. We will see that, although this analysis of the depth complexity is sufficient in many cases, that the assumption of unit depth for each displacement, implicitly assumed in the QFT(k) of Brown et al. [28], is not always valid.

5.2. The quantum Fourier transform

We briefly discuss previous results on the QFT of k qubits. In the SQCM, it is possible to implement an approximate QFT with $k \log k$ operations and a depth logarithmic in k [75, 76]. If these methods are applied to MBQC the depth can be reduced to a constant [77, 14]. It has been shown that the terminating QFT (a QFT followed directly by measurements in the computational basis) with certain input states, including product states and limited classes of entangled state, is classically simulatable [78, 79] but this is not believed to be true in general, including in the case of Shor's algorithm [78, 2].

We now consider the depth complexity of the QFT(k)$_{\text{qubus}}$ circuit decomposition of Fig. 5. $G(k) = \text{QFT}(k)$ if $x_m = 2^{m-1}$ and $p_n = 2^{1-n}\pi$, with any alternative decomposition essentially equivalent. From Fig. 5 we then have that $x_m^{'} = 2^{m-2}a$ and $p_n^{'} = \frac{\pi}{a}2^{-n}$ for some real constant a. Now as $m = 1, 2, ..., k-1$, the largest displacement required is of magnitude $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$. Therefore the total required magnitude of displacement scales as 2^k. As the time taken to implement any particular controlled displacement scales linearly with the magnitude of that displacement it is clear that the time required to implement this circuits is $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$. This is exponentially longer than the linear depth that is given by assuming that each displacement is of unit depth. It is then clear that treating each displacement as being of unit depth is not a valid assumption in this case.

The qubus model can directly simulate any SQCM circuit with only a constant increase in depth and constant magnitude displacements, and so hence as the exact QFT(k) can be implemented in a depth of $\mathcal{O}(k)$ in the SQCM this can also be achieved using the qubus but without any savings in the number of operations required. Clearly then the decomposition of Fig. 5 in the case of the QFT(k), in contrast to previous claims [28], is less computationally efficient than the standard decomposition, due to

the exponential increase in the implementation time. This is also the case for the related qubus circuit presented in [28] that simulates pairwise $\sigma_z\sigma_z$ interactions between all of the register qubits with an exponential fall-off in the interaction strength as the distance between them increases (a particular case of $G(k)$ similar to the QFT with $U_j = \mathbb{I}$ for all j).

Although we have shown that in certain cases it is not possible to find a more efficient decomposition of $G(k)$ using the qubus model, this is not in general the case and there do exist circuits with a lower computational complexity in the qubus model than the SQCM. A simple example is given by $G(k)$ when all the controlled rotations are equal but non-zero and arbitrary U_j. A more general example is given by any $G(k)$ such that x_m and p_n do not scale with k, or certain cases where they scale linearly with k. In the case of the approximate QFT [75], the structure does not admit any reduction in the order of the required number of operations via the use of the qubus model.

5.3. Computational complexity of qudit bus computation

We consider the computational complexity of the qudit bus model, implemented using discrete controlled displacements defined in the phase space $\mathbb{Z}(d) \times \mathbb{Z}(d)$, as introduced in section 3. It is straightforward to see that all the circuit decomposition results for the field-mode qubus model, including that of Fig. 5, generalise to a qudit bus of dimension d if each phase can be written as $e^{iab\frac{2\pi}{d}}$, $ab \in \mathbb{Z}$. For example, if all the rotation angles in $G(k)$ are π then a qubit bus is sufficient to implement Fig. 5. In this case Fig. 5 reduces to a SQCM circuit, and qudit bus computation is identical to the SQCM with one qubit mediating all the interactions. More general circuits will require a higher dimension of bus to enable savings in the number of operations required.

5.4. Computational complexity of spin coherent state qubus computation

We have seen that to reduce the circuit size it is necessary to have many qubits entangled with the bus at one time. When there are multiple qubits entangled with a spin coherent state bus, different parts of the superposition of bus states will be different distances from the phase space origin (the north pole). In order to make the displacements create a closed loop in phase space it was necessary to account for the distance each part of the superposition was away from the origin, as is encoded in Eq. (51). In the case of entangling two qubits, this could be achieved as after two operations they are all equidistant from the origin. However, with more qubits this is not the case, and so it is not possible to insure that all of the parts of the bus superposition return perfectly to the origin. This is due to the spherical nature of the phase space. Therefore, although in the infinite limit this is possible, for a bus composed of a finite number of spins, it is not possible to decompose the circuit of Fig. 4 into that of Fig. 5.

6. Conclusions

We have defined computational models analogous to the field-mode qubus architecture for an ancillary of arbitrary finite dimension d (a qudit) and a collection of qubits in a spin coherent state. The computation is implemented via appropriate finite generalisations of the field-mode controlled displacement operator. These schemes are of interest not only as examples of universal ancilla-mediated quantum computation, but also to highlight the fundamental link between discrete and continuous ancilla-mediated models.

We then considered the computational complexity of the qubus model. We have shown that in certain cases there exists a circuit decompositions in the qubus model that requires less operations than any known decomposition in the standard quantum circuit model. However, we have seen that such a qubus decomposition for the quantum Fourier transform (QFT)[28] is not an improvement over the standard qubus circuit for the QFT, due to the exponential scaling of the time required to implement the circuit. Furthermore, using the generalisation of the qubus model to a qudit bus, we have highlighted the relationship between the dimension of the bus and the possible reductions in the circuit size complexity. In particular, for certain circuits a qudit of low dimension will have the same computational power as a field-mode ancilla.

References

[1] Richard Feynman. Quantum mechanical computers. *Optics news*, 11(11-20):1, 1985.

[2] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM journal on computing*, 26(5):1484–1509, 1997.

[3] Adriano Barenco, Charles H Bennett, Richard Cleve, David P DiVincenzo, Norman Margolus, Peter Shor, Tycho Sleator, John A Smolin, and Harald Weinfurter. Elementary gates for quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 52(5):3457, 1995.

[4] Jennifer L. Dodd, Michael A. Nielsen, Michael J. Bremner, and Robert T. Thew. Universal quantum computation and simulation using any entangling hamiltonian and local unitaries. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65:040301, Apr 2002.

[5] Michael J Bremner, Christopher M Dawson, Jennifer L Dodd, Alexei Gilchrist, Aram W Harrow, Duncan Mortimer, Michael A Nielsen, and Tobias J Osborne. Practical scheme for quantum computation with any two-qubit entangling gate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 89(24):247902, 2002.

[6] Jean-Luc Brylinski and Ranee Brylinski. Universal quantum gates. In *Mathematics of Quantum Computation*, number chap. IV, pages 101–116. Chapman & Hall / CRC Press, 2002.

[7] Robert Raussendorf and Hans J Briegel. A one-way quantum computer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86(22):5188–5191, 2001.

[8] Robert Raussendorf, Daniel E Browne, and Hans J Briegel. Measurement-based quantum computation on cluster states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 68(2):022312, 2003.

[9] Hans J Briegel and Robert Raussendorf. Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86(5):910, 2001.

[10] Marc Hein, Wolfgang Dür, Jens Eisert, Robert Raussendorf, M Nest, and H-J Briegel. Entanglement in graph states and its applications. In *Proceedings of the International School of Physics 'Enrico Fermi' on 'Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos'*, 2005.

[11] BA Bell, MS Tame, AS Clark, RW Nock, WJ Wadsworth, and JG Rarity. Experimental characterization of universal one-way quantum computing. *New J. Phys.*, 15(5):053030, 2013.

[12] Ryuji Ukai, Noriaki Iwata, Yuji Shimokawa, Seiji C Armstrong, Alberto Politi, Jun-ichi Yoshikawa, Peter van Loock, and Akira Furusawa. Demonstration of unconditional one-way quantum computations for continuous variables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106(24):240504, 2011.

[13] Stefanie Barz, Elham Kashefi, Anne Broadbent, Joseph F Fitzsimons, Anton Zeilinger, and Philip Walther. Demonstration of blind quantum computing. *Science*, 335(6066):303–308, 2012.

[14] Dan Browne, Elham Kashefi, and Simon Perdrix. Computational depth complexity of measurement-based quantum computation. In *Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography*, pages 35–46. Springer, 2011.

[15] D Marcos, Martijn Wubs, JM Taylor, R Aguado, MD Lukin, and Anders Søndberg Sørensen. Coupling nitrogen-vacancy centers in diamond to superconducting flux qubits. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105(21):210501, 2010.

[16] Xin-You Lü, Ze-Liang Xiang, Wei Cui, JQ You, and Franco Nori. Quantum memory using a hybrid circuit with flux qubits and nitrogen-vacancy centers. *Phys. Rev. A*, 88(1):012329, 2013.

[17] Samuel G Carter, Timothy M Sweeney, Mijin Kim, Chul Soo Kim, Dmitry Solenov, Sophia E Economou, Thomas L Reinecke, Lily Yang, Allan S Bracker, and Daniel Gammon. Quantum control of a spin qubit coupled to a photonic crystal cavity. *Nature Photonics*, 7(4):329–334, 2013.

[18] Ying-Dan Wang, A Kemp, and K Semba. Coupling superconducting flux qubits at optimal point via dynamic decoupling with the quantum bus. *Phys. Rev. B*, 79(2):024502, 2009.

[19] Zheng-Yuan Xue. Fast geometric gate operation of superconducting charge qubits in circuit qed. *Quantum Inf. Process.*, 11(6):1381–1388, 2012.

[20] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, J. Majer, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf. Approaching unit visibility for control of a superconducting qubit with dispersive readout. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95:060501, Aug 2005.

[21] Andreas Wallraff, David I Schuster, Alexandre Blais, L Frunzio, R-S Huang, J Majer, S Kumar, Steven M Girvin, and Robert J Schoelkopf. Strong coupling of a single photon to a superconducting qubit using circuit quantum electrodynamics. *Nature*, 431(7005):162–167, 2004.

[22] J. Majer, J. M. Chow, J. M. Gambetta, Jens Koch, B. R. Johnson, J. A. Schreier, L. Frunzio, D. I. Schuster, A. A. Houck, A. Wallraff, A. Blais, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf. Coupling superconducting qubits via a cavity bus. *Nature*, 449(7161):443–447, 2007.

[23] Y. Yamamoto, T. D. Ladd, D. Press, S. Clark, K Sanaka, C. Santori, D. Fattal, K. M. Fu, S. Höfling, S. Reitzenstein, and A. Forchel. Optically controlled semiconductor spin qubits for quantum information processing. *Phys. Scr.*, 2009(T137):014010, 2009.

[24] AD Armour, MP Blencowe, and KC Schwab. Entanglement and decoherence of a micromechanical resonator via coupling to a cooper-pair box. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 88(14):148301–148301, 2002.

[25] WJ Munro, Kae Nemoto, Timothy P Spiller, Sean D Barrett, Pieter Kok, and Raymond G Beausoleil. Efficient optical quantum information processing. *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.*, 7(7):S135, 2005.

[26] Kae Nemoto and William J Munro. Nearly deterministic linear optical controlled-not gate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93(25):250502, 2004.

[27] Timothy P Spiller, Kae Nemoto, Samuel L Braunstein, William J Munro, Peter van Loock, and Gerard J Milburn. Quantum computation by communication. *New J. Phys.*, 8(2):30, 2006.

[28] Katherine L Brown, Suvabrata De, Vivien M Kendon, and William J Munro. Ancilla-based quantum simulation. *New J. Phys.*, 13(9):095007, 2011.

[29] Sebastien GR Louis, Kae Nemoto, WJ Munro, and TP Spiller. The efficiencies of generating cluster states with weak nonlinearities. *New J. Phys.*, 9(6):193, 2007.

[30] T. J. Proctor and T. P. Spiller. Low-error measurement-free phase gates for qubus computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 86(6):062304, 2012.

[31] Sebastien GR Louis, WJ Munro, TP Spiller, and Kae Nemoto. Loss in hybrid qubit-bus couplings and gates. *Phys. Rev. A*, 78(2):022326, 2008.

[32] SD Barrett and GJ Milburn. Quantum-information processing via a lossy bus. *Phys. Rev. A*,

74(6):060302, 2006.

[33] Janet Anders, Daniel KL Oi, Elham Kashefi, Dan E Browne, and Erika Andersson. Ancilla-driven universal quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 82(2):020301, 2010.

[34] Elham Kashefi, DKL Oi, Dan Browne, Janet Anders, and E Andersson. Twisted graph states for ancilla-driven universal quantum computation. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 249:307–331, 2009.

[35] Timothy J Proctor, Erika Andersson, and Viv Kendon. Universal quantum computation by the unitary control of ancilla qubits and using a fixed ancilla-register interaction. *Phys. Rev. A*, 88(4):042330, 2013.

[36] K. H. Shah and D. K. L. Oi. Ancilla driven quantum computation with arbitrary entangling strength. In *Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography, 8th Conference, TQC 2013, LIPIcs-Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, Vol. 23. (to appear)*, 2013.

[37] Kerem Halil Shah and Daniel KL Oi. Entangling unitary gates on distant qubits with ancilla feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3463*, 2013.

[38] Jean-Pierre Gazeau. *Coherent states in quantum physics*. Wiley, 2009.

[39] Wei-Min Zhang, Robert Gilmore, et al. Coherent states: theory and some applications. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 62(4):867, 1990.

[40] Xiaoguang Wang and Paolo Zanardi. Simulation of many-body interactions by conditional geometric phases. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65(3):032327, 2002.

[41] Yuriy Makhlin. Nonlocal properties of two-qubit gates and mixed states, and the optimization of quantum computations. *Quantum Inf. Process.*, 1(4):243–252, 2002.

[42] K. L. Brown. *Using the qubus for quantum computing*. PhD Thesis, University of Leeds, 2011.

[43] P Oscar Boykin, Tal Mor, Matthew Pulver, Vwani Roychowdhury, and Farrokh Vatan. A new universal and fault-tolerant quantum basis. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 75(3):101–107, 2000.

[44] Hui Sun, Yueping Niu, Shiqi Jin, and Shangqing Gong. Phase control of the kerr nonlinearity in electromagnetically induced transparency media. *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.*, 41(6):065504, 2008.

[45] Xudong Yang, Shujing Li, Chunhong Zhang, and Hai Wang. Enhanced cross-kerr nonlinearity via electromagnetically induced transparency in a four-level tripod atomic system. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B*, 26(7):1423–1434, 2009.

[46] Nobuyuki Matsuda, Ryosuke Shimizu, Yasuyoshi Mitsumori, Hideo Kosaka, and Keiichi Edamatsu. Observation of optical-fibre kerr nonlinearity at the single-photon level. *Nature photonics*, 3(2):95–98, 2009.

[47] Xiaoying Li, Paul L Voss, Jay E Sharping, and Prem Kumar. Optical-fiber source of polarization-entangled photons in the 1550 nm telecom band. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 94(5):053601, 2005.

[48] Martin Mücke, Eden Figueroa, Joerg Bochmann, Carolin Hahn, Karim Murr, Stephan Ritter, Celso J Villas-Boas, and Gerhard Rempe. Electromagnetically induced transparency with single atoms in a cavity. *Nature*, 465(7299):755–758, 2010.

[49] Yifu Zhu. Large kerr nonlinearities on cavity-atom polaritons. *Opt. Lett.*, 35(3):303–305, 2010.

[50] Gen Kimura. The bloch vector for¡ i¿ n¡/i¿-level systems. *Phys. Lett. A*, 314(5):339–349, 2003.

[51] Reinhold A Bertlmann and Philipp Krammer. Bloch vectors for qudits. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 41(23):235303, 2008.

[52] Gen Kimura and Andrzej Kossakowski. The bloch-vector space for n-level systems: the spherical-coordinate point of view. *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.*, 12(03):207–229, 2005.

[53] SG Schirmer, T Zhang, and JV Leahy. Orbits of quantum states and geometry of bloch vectors for n-level systems. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 37(4):1389, 2004.

[54] William K Wootters. A wigner-function formulation of finite-state quantum mechanics. *Ann. Phys.*, 176(1):1–21, 1987.

[55] Apostolos Vourdas. Quantum systems with finite hilbert space. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 67(3):267, 2004.

[56] Kathleen S Gibbons, Matthew J Hoffman, and William K Wootters. Discrete phase space based

on finite fields. *Phys. Rev. A*, 70(6):062101, 2004.

[57] Andrei B Klimov, Luis L Sánchez-Soto, and Hubert de Guise. Multicomplementary operators via finite fourier transform. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 38(12):2747, 2005.

[58] AB Klimov, JL Romero, Gunnar Björk, and LL Sánchez-Soto. Discrete phase-space structure of¡ i¿ n¡/i¿-qubit mutually unbiased bases. *Ann. Phys.*, 324(1):53–72, 2009.

[59] Gunnar Björk, Andrei B Klimov, and Luis L Sanchez-Soto. The discrete wigner function. *Progress in Optics*, 51:469–516, 2008.

[60] Andrei B Klimov, Carlos Muñoz, and Luis L Sánchez-Soto. Discrete coherent and squeezed states of many-qudit systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 80(4):043836, 2009.

[61] Radu Ionicioiu, Timothy P Spiller, and William J Munro. Generalized toffoli gates using qudit catalysis. *Phys. Rev. A*, 80(1):012312, 2009.

[62] Edwin T Jaynes and Frederick W Cummings. Comparison of quantum and semiclassical radiation theories with application to the beam maser. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 51(1):89–109, 1963.

[63] Matthew Neeley, Markus Ansmann, Radoslaw C Bialczak, Max Hofheinz, Erik Lucero, Aaron D O'Connell, Daniel Sank, Haohua Wang, James Wenner, Andrew N Cleland, and Martinis J. M. Michael, R. G. Emulation of a quantum spin with a superconducting phase qudit. *Science*, 325(5941):722–725, 2009.

[64] Stephen D Bartlett, Hubert de Guise, and Barry C Sanders. Quantum encodings in spin systems and harmonic oscillators. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65(5):052316, 2002.

[65] David T Pegg and Stephen M Barnett. Quantum optical phase. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 44(2):225–264, 1997.

[66] Joan Alfina Vaccaro and SM Barnett. *The quantum phase operator: a review*. Taylor and Francis, 2007.

[67] JM Radcliffe. Some properties of coherent spin states. *J. Phys. A: Gen. Phys.*, 4(3):313, 1971.

[68] FT Arecchi, Eric Courtens, Robert Gilmore, and Harry Thomas. Atomic coherent states in quantum optics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 6(6):2211, 1972.

[69] T Holstein and Ho Primakoff. Field dependence of the intrinsic domain magnetization of a ferromagnet. *Phys. Rev.*, 58(12):1098, 1940.

[70] Shane Dooley, Francis McCrossan, Derek Harland, Mark J Everitt, and Timothy P Spiller. Collapse and revival and cat states with an n-spin system. *Phys. Rev. A*, 87(5):052323, 2013.

[71] D Markham and V Vedral. Classicality of spin-coherent states via entanglement and distinguishability. *Phys. Rev. A*, 67(4):042113, 2003.

[72] Anne Broadbent and Elham Kashefi. Parallelizing quantum circuits. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(26):2489 – 2510, 2009.

[73] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge university press, 2010.

[74] Dmitri Maslov. Linear depth stabilizer and quantum fourier transformation circuits with no auxiliary qubits in finite-neighbor quantum architectures. *Phys. Rev. A*, 76(5):052310, 2007.

[75] Richard Cleve and John Watrous. Fast parallel circuits for the quantum fourier transform. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, pages 526–536. IEEE, 2000.

[76] Lisa Hales and Sean Hallgren. An improved quantum fourier transform algorithm and applications. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, pages 515–525. IEEE, 2000.

[77] Peter Hoyer and Robert Spalek. Quantum fan-out is powerful. *Theory of computing*, 1(5):83–101, 2005.

[78] Daniel E Browne. Efficient classical simulation of the quantum fourier transform. *New J. Phys.*, 9(5):146, 2007.

[79] Nadav Yoran and Anthony J Short. Efficient classical simulation of the approximate quantum fourier transform. *Phys. Rev. A*, 76(4):042321, 2007.